Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 000–000 (0000) Printed 4 May 2016 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

More Evidence for the Redshift Dependence of Color from the JLA Supernova Sample Using Redshift Tomography

Miao Li[1⋆], Nan Li[1,2,3,4]†, Shuang Wang[1]‡ Zhou Lanjun[1,2,3,4]§

[1] *School of Astronomy and Space Science, Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510275, P. R. China*
[2] *Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China*
[3] *Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics China, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, P. R. China*
[4] *School of Physical Science, University of Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing 100049, China*

arXiv:1601.01451v2 [astro-ph.CO] 3 May 2016

4 May 2016

ABSTRACT

In this work, by applying the redshift tomography method to Joint Light-curve Analysis (JLA) supernova sample, we explore the possible redshift-dependence of stretch-luminosity parameter α and color-luminosity parameter β. The basic idea is to divide the JLA sample into different redshift bins, assuming that α and β are piecewise constants. Then, by constraining the ΛCDM model, we check the consistency of cosmology-fit results given by the SN sample of each redshift bin. We also adopt the same technique to explore the possible evolution of β in various subsamples of JLA. Using the full JLA data, we find that α is always consistent with a constant. In contrast, at high redshift β has a significant trend of decreasing, at $\sim 3.5\sigma$ confidence level (CL). Moreover, we find that low-z subsample favors a constant β; in contrast, SDSS and SNLS subsamples favor a decreasing β at 2σ and 3.3σ CL, respectively. Besides, by using a binned parameterization of β, we study the impacts of β's evolution on parameter estimation. We find that compared with a constant β, a varying β yields a larger best-fit value of fractional matter density Ω_{m0}, which slightly deviates from the best-fit result given by other cosmological observations. However, for both the varying β and the constant β cases, the 1σ regions of Ω_{m0} are still consistent with the result given by other observations.

Key words: cosmology: dark energy, observations, cosmological parameters, supernova

1 INTRODUCTION

Type Ia supernova (SN Ia) is a sub-category of cataclysmic variable stars that results from the violent explosion of a white dwarf star in a binary system Hillebrandt, & Niemeyer (2000). It can be used as standard candles to measure the expansion history of the universe Riess et al. (1998); Perlmutter et al. (1999), and it has become one of the most powerful tools to probe the nature of dark energy (DE) Frieman et al. (2008); Wang (2010); Li et al. (2011, 2013); Weinberg et al. (2013). In recent years, several supernova (SN) datasets have been released, such as "SNLS" Astier et al. (2006), "Union" Kowalski et al. (2008), "Constitution" Hicken et al. (2009a,b), "SDSS" Kessler et al. (2009), "Union2" Amanullah et al. (2010), "SNLS3" Conley et al. (2011) and "Union2.1" Suzuki et al. (2012). The latest SN sample is "Joint Light-curve Analysis" (JLA) dataset Betoule et al. (2014), which consists of 740 supernovae (SNe). JLA data includes 118 SNe at $0 < z < 0.1$ from several low-redshift samples (Hamuy et al. 1996; Riess et al. 1999; Jha et al. 2006; Contreras et al. 2010; Hicken et al. 2009a,b), 374 SNe at $0.03 < z < 0.4$ from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) SN search Holtaman et al. (2008), 239 SNe at $0.1 < z < 1.1$ from the Supernova Legacy Survey (SNLS) observations Guy et al. (2010) and 9 SNe at $0.8 < z < 1.3$ from Hubble Space Telescope (HST) Riess et al. (2007). It should be stressed that, in the process of cosmology-fits, Betoule et al. treated two important quantities, stretch-luminosity parameter α and color-luminosity parameter β of SN Ia, as free model parameters Betoule et al. (2014). This procedure is same as the recipe of Conley et al. (2011).

The early proposals to use SN Ia as standard candles made an assumption that the early samples were too small to test. By now SN samples are large enough for many meaningful tests to be done. One of the most important tests is to probe the possibility of redshift-dependence of α and β. So far, there is no evidence for the evolution of α. But the redshift-dependence of β has been found for several SN datasets. For examples, by using the bin-by-bin method, Marriner et al. found the redshift-dependence of β for

⋆ mli@itp.ac.cn
† linan@itp.ac.cn
‡ wangshuang@mail.sysu.edu.cn (Corresponding author)
§ ljzhou@itp.ac.cn

© 0000 RAS

the SDSS data Marriner et al. (2011). Besides, by adopting a linear β, Mohlabeng and Ralston found the evolution of β at 7σ confidence level (CL) for the Union2.1 data Mohlabeng & Ralston (2013). In addition, one of the present authors had also done a series of research works about this issue. In Wang & Wang (2013a), we found that β deviates from a constant at 6σ CL for the SNLS3 data. Soon after, by studying various DE and modified gravity models with a linear β Wang et al. (2014); Wang, et al. (2014); Wang et al. (2014); Wang et al. (2015), we found that the evolution of β has significant effects on parameter estimation, and the introduction of a time-varying β can reduce the tension between SN Ia and other cosmological observations.

In a recent work Shariff et al. (2015), the discussion about time-varying β has been extended into the case of JLA data. By adopting two specific parameterizations of β, Shariff et al. found 4.6σ CL evidence for a significant drop in β at redshift $z = 0.66$ Shariff et al. (2015). It should be pointed out that, the results of Shariff et al. (2015) depend on two particular parameterizations of β. To further investigate the possible redshift-dependence of β, it is necessary to revisit this issue using a model-independent method. In this work, we adopt the redshift tomography method, which has been widely used in the investigation of cosmology Marriner et al. (2011); Cai et al. (2014); Giannantonio et al (2015). The basic idea is to divide the SN data into different redshift bins, assuming that both α and β are piecewise constants. It should be pointed out that, adopting the redshift tomography method will reduce the statistical significance. Then we constrain Λ-cold-dark-matter (ΛCDM) model and check the consistency of cosmology-fit results in each bin. In addition, it is very interesting to explore the possible evolution of β in various subsamples of JLA. As far as we know, this issue has not been studied in the past. Therefore, we also apply the same technique to various subsamples of JLA. Moreover, it is important to study the impacts of possible redshift-dependence of β on the parameter estimation. To do this, we adopt a binned parameterization of β in the analysis.

We describe our method in section 2, present our results in section 3, and summarize in section 4.

2 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we firstly introduce how to calculate the χ^2 function of JLA data. Then, we describe the details of the redshift tomography method.

Theoretically, the distance modulus μ_{th} in a flat universe can be written as

$$\mu_{th} = 5\log_{10}\left[\frac{d_L(z_{hel}, z_{cmb})}{Mpc}\right] + 25, \tag{1}$$

where z_{cmb} and z_{hel} are the CMB restframe and heliocentric redshifts of SN. The luminosity distance d_L is given by

$$d_L(z_{hel}, z_{cmb}) = \frac{(1+z_{hel})c}{H_0}\int_0^{z_{cmb}}\frac{dz}{E(z)}, \tag{2}$$

where c is the speed of light, H_0 is the Hubble constant and $E(z) \equiv H(z)/H_0$ is the reduced Hubble parameter. For ΛCDM, $E(z)$ can be written as

$$E(z) = \sqrt{\Omega_{m0}(1+z)^3 + (1-\Omega_{m0})}. \tag{3}$$

Here Ω_{m0} is the present fractional matter density.

The observation of distance modulus μ_{obs} is given by a empirical linear relation:

$$\mu_{obs} = m_B^\star - M_B + \alpha \times X_1 - \beta \times \mathcal{C}, \tag{4}$$

where $m_B^\star$ is the observed peak magnitude in the rest-frame of the B band, X_1 describes the time stretching of light-curve, $\mathcal{C}$ describes the supernova color at maximum brightness and M_B is the absolute B-band magnitude, which depends on the host galaxy properties Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011); Johansson et al. (2013). Notice that M_B is related to the host stellar mass ($M_{stellar}$) by a simple step function Betoule et al. (2014)

$$M_B = \begin{cases} M_B^1 & \text{if} \quad M_{\text{stellar}} < 10^{10}\, M_\odot\,, \\ M_B^2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Here $M_\odot$ is the mass of sun.

The χ^2 of JLA data can be calculated as

$$\chi^2 = \Delta\mu^T \cdot \mathbf{Cov}^{-1} \cdot \Delta\mu, \tag{6}$$

where $\Delta\mu \equiv \mu_{obs} - \mu_{th}$ is the data vector and **Cov** is the total covariance matrix, which is given by

$$\mathbf{Cov} = \mathbf{D}_{\rm stat} + \mathbf{C}_{\rm stat} + \mathbf{C}_{\rm sys}. \tag{7}$$

Here $\mathbf{D}_{\rm stat}$ is the diagonal part of the statistical uncertainty, which is given by Betoule et al. (2014),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{D}_{\rm stat,ii} \quad = \quad & \left[\frac{5}{z_i \ln 10}\right]^2 \sigma_{z,i}^2 + \sigma_{\rm int}^2 + \sigma_{\rm lensing}^2 + \sigma_{m_B,i}^2 \\ & + \alpha^2\sigma_{X_1,i}^2 + \beta^2\sigma_{\mathcal{C},i}^2 + 2\alpha C_{m_B X_1,i} - 2\beta C_{m_B \mathcal{C},i} \\ & - 2\alpha\beta C_{X_1\mathcal{C},i},\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the first three terms account for the uncertainty in redshift due to peculiar velocities, the intrinsic variation in SN magnitude and the variation of magnitudes caused by gravitational lensing. $\sigma_{m_B,i}^2$, $\sigma_{X_1,i}^2$, and $\sigma_{\mathcal{C},i}^2$ denote the uncertainties of m_B, X_1 and $\mathcal{C}$ for the i-th SN. In addition, $C_{m_B X_1,i}$, $C_{m_B\mathcal{C},i}$ and $C_{X_1\mathcal{C},i}$ are the covariances between m_B, X_1 and $\mathcal{C}$ for the i-th SN. Moreover, $\mathbf{C}_{\rm stat}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\rm sys}$ are the statistical and the systematic covariance matrices, given by

$$\mathbf{C}_{\rm stat} + \mathbf{C}_{\rm sys} = V_0 + \alpha^2 V_a + \beta^2 V_b + 2\alpha V_{0a} - 2\beta V_{0b} - 2\alpha\beta V_{ab}, \tag{9}$$

where V_0, V_a, V_b, V_{0a}, V_{0b} and V_{ab} are matrices given by the JLA group at the link: http://supernovae.in2p3.fr/sdss_snls_jla/ReadMe.html. For the detailed discussions about JLA SN sample, see Ref. Betoule et al. (2014).

As pointed out in Betoule et al. (2014), in the process of calculating χ^2, both the Hubble constant H_0 and the absolute B-band magnitude M_B are marginalized. In this work, we follow the procedure of Betoule et al. (2014), and do not treat H_0 and M_B as free parameters. We refer the reader to Ref. Betoule et al. (2014), as well as the code of the JLA likelihood for the details of calculation.

As mentioned above, our aim is to explore the possible evolution of SN using a model-independent method. In this work, we adopt the redshift tomography method. The basic idea is to divide the SN sample into different redshift bins, assuming that both α and β are are piecewise constants. Then, by constraining the ΛCDM model, we check the consistency of cosmology-fit results given by the SN sample of each redshift bin. Moreover, to ensure that our results are insensitive to the details of redshift tomography, we evenly divide the JLA sample at redshift region [0,1] into 3 bins, 4 bins and 5 bins, respectively; then, we compare the fitting results obtained from these three cases. In this work we perform a MCMC likelihood analysis using the "CosmoMC" package (Lewis & Bridle 2002).

3 RESULT

In this section, we mainly focus on the evolution behaviors of luminosity standardization parameters α and β. Firstly, we present the results given by the full JLA sample; then, we present the results given by various subsamples of JLA; finally, we discuss the impacts of time-varying β on parameter estimation.

In Fig 1, we plot the 1σ confidence regions of α given by the full JLA sample. The results of 3 bins, 4 bins and 5 bins are shown in the upper left panel, the upper right panel and the lower panel of Fig 1, respectively. For all the panels, it can be seen that the 1σ regions of α given by the full JLA sample (gray region) overlap with the results given by the SN samples of various bins at 1σ CL. So we can conclude that α is consistent with a constant. Since this conclusion holds true for all the cases of 3 bins, 4 bins and 5 bins. we can conclude that it is insensitive to the details of redshift tomography. This conclusion is consistent with the results of previous studies Marriner et al. (2011); Mohlabeng & Ralston (2013); Wang & Wang (2013a); Shariff et al. (2015).

In Fig 2, we plot the 1σ confidence regions of β given by the full JLA sample. The results of 3 bins, 4 bins and 5 bins are shown in the upper left panel, the upper right panel and the lower panel of Fig 2, respectively. It can be seen that, although β is consistent with a constant at low redshift, it has a significant trend of decreasing at high redshift. For the case of 3 bins, the 1σ upper bound of β in the last bin deviates from the results given by the full JLA sample at 3.5σ CL. For the case of 4 bins, the 1σ upper bound of β in the last bin deviates from the results given by the full JLA sample at 3.6σ CL. For the case of 5 bins, there is a hint for the evolution of β for the fourth bin; moreover, the 1σ upper bound of β in the last bin deviates from the results given by the full JLA sample at 3.6σ CL. These results indicate that there is a $\sim 3.5\sigma$ CL evidence for the decrease of β at high redshift, which is insensitive to the details of redshift tomography [1]. It must be stressed that, this conclusion is consistent with the results of some other SN samples Marriner et al. (2011); Mohlabeng & Ralston (2013), but is inconsistent with the results of the SNLS3 dataset, which indicates that β has a trend of increasing at high redshift Wang & Wang (2013a). The reason of this tension is still unclear and deserves further studies.

As mentioned above, JLA dataset includes 118 SNe at $0 < z < 0.1$ from the low-z, 374 SNe at $0.03 < z < 0.4$ from the SDSS, 239 SNe at $0.1 < z < 1.1$ from the SNLS, and 9 SNe at $0.8 < z < 1.3$ from HST. It is interesting to explore the evolution of β in various subsamples of JLA. In this paper we only directly apply the redshift tomography method to the low-z, the SDSS, and the SNLS subsamples, because the HST subsample only contains 9 data points. To study the effects of HST subsample, we compare the results of the full JLA sample with the results of the "JLA without HST" data.

In the Fig 3, making use of the redshift tomography method, we show the 1σ confidence regions of β given by each subsample. The results given by the low-z, the SDSS, and the SNLS subsamples are shown in the upper left panel, the upper right panel, and the lower panel of Fig 3, respectively. For simplicity, here we only consider the case of 4 bins. For the case of low-z, β is always consistent with a constant. For the case of SDSS, the 1σ upper bound of β in the last bin deviates from the results given by the full SDSS subsample at 2σ CL, showing that the SDSS subsample favors a decreasing β at high redshift. This conclusion is consistent with the results of Marriner et al. (2011). For the case of SNLS, the 1σ upper bounds of β in the third bin and the fourth bin deviate from the results of the full SNLS subsample at 1.6σ and 3.3σ CL, respectively. So compared with the case of SDSS, the SNLS subsample favors a time-varying β with a larger decreasing rate. It should be mentioned that, this conclusion is different from the results of the full SNLS3 sample Wang & Wang (2013a). This means that SNLS3 dataset may exist some unknown systematic uncertainties Betoule et al. (2014).

In Fig 4, we compare the 1σ confidence regions of β given by the "JLA without HST" data (left panel) with the results given by the full JLA sample (right panel). We can see that the HST subsample only affects the evolution behavior of β at high redshift. For the case without HST, the 1σ upper bound of β in the last bin deviates from the results given by the full sample at 3.9σ CL. For the case of full JLA sample, the 1σ upper bound of β in the last bin deviates from the results given by the full JLA sample at 3.6σ CL. This indicates that HST subsample can slightly slow down the decreasing rate of β at high redshift.

Next, we discuss the impacts of a varying β on the parameter estimation. For simplicity, here we consider the standard cosmological model: the ΛCDM model. As shown in Fig 2, β perfers a higher value at low redshift and a lower value at high redshift. So we assume that β is related to the redshift by a simple piecewise function

$$\beta(z) = \begin{cases} \beta_1 & 0 < z \leqslant 0.75\,, \\ \beta_2 & 0.75 < z \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where β_1 and β_2 are two model parameters. In Fig 5, by using the full JLA sample only, we plot the 1D marginalized probability distributions of Ω_{m0} in the cases of constant β and varying $\beta(z)$. It can be seen that varying β yields a lager Ω_{m0} than the case of constant β: for the case of varying β, the best-fit value of Ω_{m0} is 0.329, while for the case of constant β, the best-fit value of Ω_{m0} is 0.297. Note that our result is consistent with the results of Shariff et al. (2015). To make a comparison, in Fig 5 we also plot the 1D marginalized probability distribution of Ω_{m0} given by a combination of the CMB Ade et al. (2015) [2] and the Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) Hemantha et al. (2014); Wang (2014) data. The best-fit value of Ω_{m0} given by CMB+BAO data is 0.292, which is closer to the best-fit value of the constant β case. This result is different from the result of the SNLS3 sample Wang et al. (2014). However, the result of Ω_{m0} for the varying β case is still consistent with the result for the constant β case, as well as the result given by the CMB+BAO data, at 1σ CL.

4 SUMMARY

SN Ia is one of the most powerful tools to explore the current cosmic acceleration. As the sample size of SN Ia rapidly grows, it is very important to perform various tests for these SN samples. One of the most interesting tests is to probe the possible evolution of SN color parameter, which has drawn a lot of attentions in recent

[1] To further confirm this point, we move all the bins $1/4$ bin width to the right and $1/4$ bin width to the left; then we check whether or not there are any significant differences for these two cases. It is found that moving bins in such a way will not yield any significant changes. Therefore, we conclude that the conclusion of β's evolution is insensitive to the details of redshift tomography.

[2] In addition to Ade et al. (2015), there are some other distance priors data, e.g. see Refs. Wang & Dai (2015); Huang et al. (2015); Wang & Wang (2013b).



Figure 1. The 1σ confidence regions of stretch-luminosity parameter α given by the full JLA sample at redshift region [0,1]. The results of 3 bins, 4 bins and 5 bins are shown in the upper left panel, the upper right panel and the lower panel. The gray region and the gray dashed line denote the 1σ region and the best-fit result given by the full JLA data. The red, the green, the blue, the yellow and the purple regions correspond to the 1σ regions of the first, the second, the third, the fourth and the fifth bin, respectively.

years Marriner et al. (2011); Mohlabeng & Ralston (2013); Wang & Wang (2013a); Shariff et al. (2015). [3]

In a latest work Shariff et al. (2015), adopting two particular parameterizations of β, Shariff et al. found 4.6σ CL evidence for a significant drop in β at redshift $z = 0.66$, for the JLA sample. In the current work, we revisit the possibility of β's evolution by using the redshift tomography method. In addition to the full JLA sample, we also study the cases of various JLA subsamples. So far as we know, the effects of various JLA subsamples on β's evolution have not been studied in the past. Moreover, we also briefly discuss the impacts of time-varying β on parameter estimation are also studied.

Our conclusions are as follows:

- If the full JLA sample is used, then α is always consistent with a constant (see Fig 1), and β has a significant trend of decreasing, $\sim 3.5\sigma$ CL, at high redshift (see Fig 2). It should be pointed out that, due to that the redshift tomography method tends to reduce statistical significance, the redshift-dependence of β is studied the hard way in this work. Since the effect of β's evolution is strong enough to be found after adopting the redshift tomography method, we can conclude that the evolution of β is indisputable.
- If the low-z subsample of JLA is used, then a constant β is favored. In contrast, if the SDSS or the SNLS subsamples is adopted, then a decreasing β is favored. Besides, compared with SDSS subsample, SNLS subsample prefers a larger decreasing rate of β (see Fig 3). It should be pointed out that the trajectory of β given by the SNLS subsample of JLA is quite different from the prediction of the full SNLS3 sample Wang & Wang (2013a). This means that the SNLS3 dataset may have some unknown systematic bias, or anomalies, not accounted for by the reported systematic uncertainties of SNLS3.
- If the HST subsample is removed from the full JLA data, then the decreasing rate of β at high redshift will be slightly enlarged (see Fig 4).
- If a binned parameterization of β is adopted, then a larger best-fit value of Ω_{m0} will be obtained, compared to the case of constant β. However, if the information of 1σ region is taken into account, then for both the time-varying β and the constant β cases, the results of Ω_{m0} are consistent with the result given by the CMB+BAO data.

In this paper, we only consider the simplest ΛCDM model. In addition to ΛCDM, many other DE models Li (2004); Chevallier & Polarski (2001); Linder (2003) are also favored by current cosmological observations. It is of interest to study the effects of varying β on parameter estimation in other dark energy models Zlatev et al. (1999); Caldwell (2002); Li (2004); Wang & Zhang (2008); Wang

[3] In addition to exploring the possible evolution of β, there are some other meaningful tests for SN smaples, e.g. see Refs. Bengochea (2011); Kim (2011); Hu et al. (2015a); Wang et al. (2012); Wang (2000)



Figure 2. The 1σ confidence regions of color-luminosity parameter β given by JLA full sample at redshift region [0,1]. The results of 3 bins, 4 bins and 5 bins are shown in the upper left panel, the upper right panel and the lower panel. The gray region and the gray dashed line denote the 1σ region and the best-fit result given by the full JLA data. The red, the green, the blue, the yellow and the purple regions correspond to the 1σ regions of the first, the second, the third, the fourth and the fifth bin, respectively.

et al. (2008); Li et al. (2009a,b); Huang et al. (2009); Lan et al. (2010); Wang et al. (2010, 2011); Li et al. (2011); Zhang et al. (2012); Li et al. (2013); Hu et al. (2015b); Wang et al. (2016). This will be done in future works.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are very grateful to the referee for the valuable suggestions. We also thank Prof. Yi Wang for carefully reading the manuscript of this work. ML is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11275247, and Grant No. 11335012) and 985 grant at Sun Yat-Sen University. SW is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 11405024 and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under Grant No. 16lgpy50.

REFERENCES

Ade P. A. R. et al., 2015, arXiv:1502.01589
Amanullah R. et al., 2010, ApJ, 716, 712
Astier P. et al., 2006, A&A, 447, 31
Bengochea G. R., 2011, Phys. Lett. B 696, 5
Betoule M. et al., 2014, A&A, 568, A22
Cai R.-G., Guo Z.-K., Tang B., 2014, Phys. Rev. D, 89, 123518
Caldwell R. R., 2002, Phys. Lett. B, 545, 23
Chevallier M., Polarski D., 2001, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D, 10, 213;
Conley A. et al., 2011, Astrophys. J. Suppl. 192, 1
Contreras C., et al. 2010, AJ, 139, 519
Frieman J. A., Turner S. M., Huterer D., 2008 Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 46, 385
Giannantonio T. et al., 2015 arXiv:1507.05551
Guy J. et al., 2010, A&A, 523, 7
Hamuy M. et al., 1996, AJ, 112, 2408
Hemantha M. D. P., Wang Y., Chuang C.-H., 2014, MNRAS, 445, 3737
Hicken M., Wood-Vasey W. M., Blondin S., Challis P., Jha S., Kelly P. L., Rest A., Kirshner R. P., 2009, ApJ., 700, 1097;
Hicken M. et al., 2009, ApJ., 700, 331
Hillebrandt W., Niemeyer J. C., 2000, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. 38, 191
Holtzman J., et al. 2008, AJ, 136, 2306
Huang Q. G., Li M., Li X.-D., & Wang S., 2009, Phys. Rev. D, 80, 083515
Huang Q.-G., Wang S., Wang K., 2015, JCAP, 12, 022
Hu Y.-Z., Li M., Li N., Wang S., 2015a, arXiv:1501.06962
Hu Y.-Z., Li M., Li N., Wang S., 2015b, arXiv:1506.08274
Jha S. et al., 2006, AJ, 131, 527
Johansson J. et al., 2013, MNRAS, 435, 1680
Kessler R., et al., 2009, ApJS., 185, 32
Kim A., 2011, Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac., 123, 230
Kowalski M., et al., 2008, ApJ., 686, 749



Figure 3. The 1σ confidence regions of β given by the three subsamples: low-z (upper left panel), SDSS (upper right panel) and SNLS (lower panel). The gray region and the gray dashed line are the 1σ region and the best-fit result given by the full low-z, the full SDSS and the full SNLS subsample, respectively. The red, the green, the blue and the yellow regions correspond to the 1σ regions of the first, the second, the third and the fourth bin, respectively.



Figure 4. The 1σ confidence regions of β given by the "JLA without HST" data (left panel) and the full JLA sample (right panel) at redshift region [0,1]. The gray regions and the gray dashed lines denote the 1σ regions and the best-fit results given by the full samples, respectively. The red, the green, the blue and the yellow regions correspond to the 1σ regions of the first, the second, the third, and the fourth bin, respectively.

Lan M.-X., Li M., Li X.-D., Wang S., 2010, Phys. Rev. D 82, 023516

Lewis A., Bridle S., 2002, Phys. Rev. D, 66, 103511

Li M., 2004, Phys. Lett. B, 603 1

Li M., Li X.-D., Wang S., Zhang X., 2009a, JCAP, 06, 036

Li M., Li X.-D., Wang S., Wang Y., Zhang X., 2009b, JCAP, 12, 014

Li M., Li X.-D., Wang S., Wang Y., 2011, Commun. Theor. Phys. 56, 525

Li M., Li X.-D., Wang S., Wang Y., 2013, Frontiers of Physics 8, 828

Li Y.-H., Wang S., Li X.-D., Zhang X., 2013, JCAP 02, 033

Li X.-D., Li S., Wang S., Zhang W.-S., Huang Q.-G., Li M., 2011, JCAP 1107, 011



Figure 5. The 1D marginalized probability distributions of Ω_{m0} given by the full JLA sample for the ΛCDM model. Both the results of constant β (green dash-dotted line) and varying β (red solid line) cases are presented. The corresponding results given by the CMB+BAO data (black dashed line) are also shown for comparison.

Linder E. V., 2003, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 091301.
Marriner J. et al., 2011, ApJ. 740, 72
Mohlabeng G., Ralston J., 2013, MNRAS, 439, L16
Perlmutter S. et al., 1999, ApJ, 517, 565
Riess A. G. et al., 1998, AJ, 116, 1009
Riess A. G. et al., 1999, AJ, 117, 707
Riess A. G. et al., 2007, ApJ. 659, 98
Schlafly E. F., Finkbeiner D. P., 2011, ApJ. 737, 103
Shariff H., Jiao X., Trotta R., Dyk D. A. v., arXiv:1510.05954
Suzuki N. et al., 2012, ApJ, 746, 85
Wang S., Geng J.-J., Hu Y.-L., Zhang X., 2015, Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. 58, 019801
Wang S., Hu Y., Li M., Li N., 2016, ApJ 821, 60
Wang S., Li X.-D., Li M., 2010, Phys. Rev. D, 82, 103006
Wang S., Li X.-D., Li M., 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 83, 023010
Wang S., Li Y.-H., Zhang X., 2014, Phys. Rev. D, 89, 063524
Wang S., Wang Y., 2013a, Phys. Rev. D, 88, 043511
Wang S., Wang Y.-Z., Geng J.-J., Zhang X., 2014, Eur. Phys. J. C 74, 3148
Wang S., Wang Y.-Z., Zhang X., 2014, Commun. Theor. Phys. 62, 927
Wang, S. & Zhang, Y. 2008, Phys. Lett. B, 669, 201
Wang S., Zhang Y., Xia T.-Y., 2008, JCAP, 10, 037
Wang Y., 2000, ApJ, 536, 531.
Wang Y., *Dark Energy*, Wiley-VCH, 2010, New York, (2010)
Wang Y., 2014, MNRAS, 443, 2950
Wang Y., Chuang C. H., Mukherjee P., 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 85, 023517
Wang Y., Dai M. arXiv:1509.02198
Wang Y. & Wang S., 2013b, Phys. Rev. D 88, 043522
Weinberg D. H., Mortonson M. J., Eisenstein D.J. et al. 2013, Physics Reports, 530, 87
Zhang Z. H., Li M., Li X.-D., Wang S., Zhang W.-S., 2012, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 27, 1250115
Zlatev I., Wang L. Steinhardt P.J. 1999, Phys. Rev. Lett., 82, 896